

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-6 and 8-11 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 have been amended. Claims 2-3, 7 and 12-15 have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite that transaction data is stored both on the POS terminal and also on the store server.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 7-8 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,978,774 to Rogers et al. (hereafter, "**Rogers et al.**") in view of U.S. Patent 6,016,480 to Houvener et al. (hereafter, "**Houvener et al.**").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**Rogers et al.** discloses an electronic registration system which facilitates authorized product returns and reduces the incidence of improper returns. A retailer sales associate is prompted to enter individual product identification information such as an individual serial number. This individual product identification information is then stored in a data base along with the date on which the product was sold and an appropriate UPC code, SKU number or manufacturer code. A check digit algorithm may be used to verify the serial number prior to storage. A sales receipt may be imprinted with at least the date of the transaction and the serial number. When a product is returned, the retailer may cross-reference the serial number on the

product with that on the receipt to verify the sales receipt. Otherwise, the database may be searched for pertinent sales information.

Among other things, the Examiner has specifically urged that column 4, lines 8-10 teach “a means for querying said store server and requesting transaction data relating to a transaction that occurred at another POS terminal with means for instructing said store server to cancel the transaction that occurred at another POS terminal.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. This passage actually discloses:

The operator terminal may be used, for example, by a store clerk upon return of merchandise to locate pertinent sales information in the local database.

Thus, there is no disclosure in Rogers et al. of one POS (other than a POS at which the transaction occurred) transmitting a transaction cancel instruction to the server, which then transmits the request to the POS at which the transaction did occur, as in the claimed invention.

Houvener et al. has been cited for teaching that returns may be performed at every POS terminal but, like Rogers et al., fails to disclose that one POS (other than the POS at which the transaction occurred) may cancel a transaction performed at another POS, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

In other words, the present invention overcomes the problem of being able to correct transaction data stored in POS terminal B from POS terminal A in a POS system having a store server and a plurality of POS terminals, both of which have means for storing transaction data. If only the store server has means for storing transaction data, such a problem does not arise.

In order to correct transaction data stored in POS terminal A by POS terminal B, in the POS terminal of the present invention, POS terminal B can obtain transaction data relating to a transaction that occurred at POS terminal A through the store server, correct the transaction data thus obtained, and transfer the corrected transaction data to the store server as transaction data relating to a new transaction that occurred at POS terminal B.

The combination of Houvener et al. and Rogers et al. fails to teach, mention or suggest this feature.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5-6 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Rogers et al. in view of Houvener et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,319,326 to Uchida (hereafter, "Uchida").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Uchida has been cited for teaching an electronic cash register system with a consolidating means (totalizing).

Uchida, like the other cited references, fails to teach, mention or suggest the features of claim 1, from which these claims depend.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1, 4-6 and 8-11, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.


U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/976,153**  
Response to Office Action dated August 16, 2006

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

  
William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak  
Atty. Docket No. **011375**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE